

Persuasive Essay Annotation Guide

March 24, 2024

Contents

1	Annotation Procedure	2
2	Attributes Summary	3
3	Entity Summary	3
4	Eloquence	4
5	Specificity	5
5.1	Premise Specificity	6
5.2	Claim/MajorClaim Specificity	7
6	Premise Type	8
7	Claim Type	9
8	Relevance	10
9	Persuasiveness	11
10	Evidence	12

1 Annotation Procedure

Annotation should be performed in a bottom-up/depth-first manner.

1. Read through the essay for comprehension and a holistic understanding of its persuasiveness.
2. For the first Claim, annotate all bottom-level Premises (Premises not supported by other Premises). For each Premise:
 - (a) Annotate the Eloquence, Specificity, and PremiseType.
 - (b) Reread the parent entity and assign a Relevance score.
 - (c) Score the persuasiveness contribution of the Premise.
3. Annotate all Premises that are completely supported by other fully annotated Premises.
4. Repeat until all Premises of the first Claim are annotated.
5. Annotate the first Claim.
 - (a) Review the supporting Premises and their attributes.
 - (b) Score the Specificity, Evidence, and whether or not the author uses Logos, Pathos, or Ethos in the argument.
 - (c) Annotate the ClaimType and Eloquence.
 - (d) Score the Persuasiveness.
 - (e) Reread the MajorClaims and assign a Relevance score.
6. Repeat steps 2–5 for the remaining Claims.
7. Annotate the MajorClaims. For each MajorClaim:
 - (a) Review the supporting Claims and their attributes.
 - (b) Assign an Evidence score.
 - (c) Determine whether or not the argument uses Logos, Pathos, or Ethos in the argument.
 - (d) Score the Specificity.
 - (e) Assign an Eloquence score
 - (f) Score the Persuasiveness.

2 Attributes Summary

Name	Description
Persuasiveness:	The general persuasiveness of the argument. If the entity is a Premise, the Persuasiveness score indicates the contribution made to the parent argument.
	(1–6; Claim, MajorClaim, Premise)
	Depends on: PremiseType, Ethos/Pathos/Logos, Relevance, Eloquence, Specificity
Relevance:	The relevance of the statement to the parent entity.
	(1–6; Claim, Premise)
	Depends on: Eloquence and Specificity of Child and Parent entities, text
PremiseType:	The type of Premise, e.g. statistics, definition, real example, etc.
	(see section 6; Premise)
	Depends on: text
Logos/Pathos/Ethos:	Whether or not the argument uses the respective persuasive strategy
	(yes,no; MajorClaim, Claim)
	Depends on: text, child entities
Evidence:	The holistic summary of the supporting statements making up the argument body of that specific entity
	(1–6; Claim, MajorClaim)
	Depends on: child entities
ClaimType:	The category of what is being claimed (Value, Fact, Policy; Claim)
	Depends on: Text
Specificity:	How detailed and specific the statement is.
	(1–5; Claim, MajorClaim, Premise)
	Depends on: Text
Eloquence:	How well the idea is presented. Influenced by grammar, vocabulary, and sentence structure.
	(1–5; Premise)
	Depends on: Text

3 Entity Summary

- MajorClaim** - Persuasiveness, Logos/Pathos/Ethos, Evidence, Eloquence, Specificity
- Claim** - Persuasiveness, ClaimType, Relevance, Logos/Pathos/Ethos, Evidence, Eloquence, Specificity
- Premise** - Persuasiveness, PremiseType, Relevance, Eloquence, Specificity

4 Eloquence

Eloquence Score descriptions

Score	Description
5	Demonstrates mastery of the English language. There are no grammatical errors that distract from the meaning of the sentence. Exhibits a well thought out, flowing sentence structure that is easy to read and conveys the idea exceptionally well.
	Ex: Contrary to the past when people had to wait long hours to take a daily newspaper, nowadays, they can acquire latest news updated every second through their mobile phones or computers connected to the internet, everywhere and at anytime
4	Demonstrates fluency in English. If there are any grammatical or syntactical errors, their affect on the meaning is negligible. Word choice suggests a broad vocabulary.
	Ex:
3	Demonstrates competence in the English language. There might be one or two errors that are noticeable but forgivable, such as an incorrect verb tense or unnecessary pluralization. Demonstrates a typical vocabulary and a simple sentence structure.
	Ex:
2	Demonstrates poor understanding of sentence composition and/or poor vocabulary. The choice of words or grammatical errors force the reader to reread the sentence before moving on.
	Ex:
1	Demonstrates minimal eloquence. The sentence contains errors so severe that the sentence must be carefully analyzed to deduce its meaning.
	Ex: Health education will help people to have right choices of treatment to recover more quickly

5 Specificity

Specificity score descriptions and examples.

5.1 Premise Specificity

Score	Description
5	<p>A score of 5 indicates an elaborate, very specific statement. The statement contains numerical data, or a historical example from the real world. There is both:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a sufficient qualifier indicating a the extent to which the statement holds true • an explanation of why the statement is true <p>or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at least one real world example <p>or:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a sufficient description of a hypothetical situation that would evoke a mental image of the situation in the minds of most readers
	Ex: Take Thailand for example, in the Vietnam War, many American soldiers came to Thailand for a break and involved in sexual and drug activities, these huge demands caused many local businesses opened and expanded, even illegally involved in under-age prostitutes to maximize their profits.
4	A score of 4 indicates a more specific statement. It is characterized by either an explanation of why the statement is true, or a qualifier indicating when/to what extent the statement is true. Alternatively, it may list examples of items that do not qualify as historical events.
	Ex: Compared to the peers studying in the home country, it will be more likely for the one who is living overseas to be successful in adapting himself/herself into new environments and situations in life
	Ex: Before email and mobile phone, human beings communicated by meeting directly, sending letters or later, calling from home phones
3	A score of 3 indicates a sufficiently specific statement. It simply states a relationship or a fact with little ambiguity.
	Ex: employers are mostly looking for people who have international and language skills
	Ex: They can learn about their way of thinking, their customs and traditions, and way of life.
2	A broad statement. A statement with weak qualifiers such as “maybe,” “might,” and “sometimes,” will receive a score of 2 without other redeeming factors such as explicit examples, or elaborate reasoning. Additionally, there are few adjectives or adverbs.
	Ex: students might face many challenges in the host country
1	An extremely broad statement. There is no underlying explanation, qualifiers, or real-world examples.
	Ex: Learning about others’ cultures is so important.

5.2 Claim/MajorClaim Specificity

Score	Description
5	Summarizes the argument well and has a qualifier that indicates the extent to which the claim holds true. Claims that summarize the argument well must reference most or all of the supporting entities.
4	A Claim that scores a 4 must summarize the argument very well by mentioning most or all of the supporting entities, but does not have a qualifier indicating the conditions under which the claim holds true. Alternatively, the Claim may moderately summarize the argument by referencing a minority of supporting entities and contain qualifier.
3	A Claim with specificity 3 has a qualifier clause or references a minority of the supporting entities, but not both.
2	A Claim with specificity 2 does not make an attempt to summarize the argument nor does it contain a qualifier clause.
1	Simply rephrases the Majorclaim or is outside scope of the Majorclaim (entities were annotated incorrectly: Majorclaim could be used to support Claim).

Note: A MajorClaim cannot receive a score of 1.

Note: Some MajorClaims have an argument summary labeled as an independent claim with no supporting attributes.

6 Premise Type

Type	Description
real_example	A historical example of something that actually happened, or a specific, non-generic, statement that is verifiably true about the real world.
	Ex: Women like Margaret Thatcher, Indira Gandhi, Mari Curie etc., are symbols of women's intelligence and skills.
	Ex:
invented_instance	A hypothetical situation that did not actually occur.
	Ex: Take Olympic games which is a form of competition for instance, it is hard to imagine how an athlete could win the game without the training of his or her coach, and the help of other professional staffs such as the people who take care of his diet, and those who are in charge of the medical care
analogy	
testimony	A quote from, or reference to a higher authority.
statistics	Raw numerical data or a quantitative comparison of values.
definition	An explicit definition of a term/concept.
common_knowledge	A conjecture or generalization that the author assumes most people would accept as true.
warrant	Performs one of the following functions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restates the parent claim • expands/upon clarifies the parent claim • explains how a sibling premise relates to the parent claim.
opinion	A controversial statement that would be unanimously accepted as an opinion. Could easily be the thesis of its own persuasive essay.

7 Claim Type

Type	Description
Fact	The claim states that something is true or false.
	Ex:
Value	The claim states that something is important, or not important, or has some other value attached to it.
	Ex:
Policy	The claim states that a certain law or rule should be implemented and enforced.
	Ex:

8 Relevance

Relevance score descriptions.

Score	Description
6	Anyone can see how the support relates to the parent claim. The relationship between the two entities is either explicit or extremely easy to infer. The relationship is thoroughly explained in the text because the two entities contain the same words or exhibit coreference.
	Premises that are paired with a warrant sufficiently explaining the relationship to the parent claim (and the warrant itself) score a 6. If the warrant does a poor job of this, then the Premise and the Warrant receive the same, lower score.
5	There is an implied relationship that is obvious, but it could be improved upon to remove all doubt. If the relationship is obvious, both relating entities must have high eloquence and specificity scores.
4	The relationship is fairly clear. The relationship can be inferred from the context of the two statements. One entity must have a high eloquence and specificity scores and the other must have lower but sufficient eloquence and specificity scores for the relationship to be fairly clear.
3	Somewhat related. It takes some thinking to imagine how the entities relate. The parent entity or the child entity have low clarity scores. Two statements about the same topic but unrelated ideas within the domain of said topic would get a score of 3.
2	Mostly unrelated. It takes some major assumptions to relate the two entities. An entity may also receive this score if both entities have low clarity scores.
1	Totally unrelated. Very few people could see how the two entities relate to each other. The statement was annotated to show that it relates to the claim, but this was clearly in error.

9 Persuasiveness

Argument strength score descriptions.

Score	Description
6	A very strong, clear argument. It would persuade most readers and is devoid of errors that might detract from its strength or make it difficult to understand.
Claim/MajorClaim	
Premise	
5	A strong, pretty clear argument. It would persuade most readers, but may contain some minor errors that detract from its strength or understandability.
Claim/MajorClaim	
Premise	
4	A decent, fairly clear argument. It could persuade some readers, but contains errors that detract from its strength or understandability.
Claim/MajorClaim	
Premise	
3	A poor, understandable argument. It might persuade readers who are already inclined to agree with it, but contains severe errors that detract from its strength or understandability.
Claim/MajorClaim	
Premise	
2	It is unclear what the author is trying to argue or the argument is poor and just so riddled with errors as to be completely unpersuasive.
Claim/MajorClaim	
Premise	
1	The author doesn't appear to make any argument (e.g. he may just describe some incident without explaining why it is important). It could not persuade any readers because there is nothing to be persuaded of. It may or may not contain detectable errors, but errors are moot since there is not an argument for them to interfere with.
Claim/MajorClaim;	
Premise	

Note: Persuasiveness is a property specific to arguments. Premises and claims by themselves do not constitute arguments, so the “persuasiveness” attribute has a slightly different meaning than the name implies. With respect to claims and majorclaims, the “persuasiveness” score refers to the argument corresponding to the claim.

10 Evidence

6 - Indicates a very strong, very persuasive argument body. There are many supporting entities that have high relevance scores.

There may be a few attacking child entities. These entities must be used for either

- **Concession:** acknowledging valid points on the opposing side

A child entity successfully used for a concession will itself have a strong Persuasiveness score. An entity will have a high Evidence score if there is a small number of concessions with good persuasiveness. These concessions do not significantly detract from the original arguments strength. They enhance persuasiveness by revealing the author's knowledge of the subject and show that the author is aware that the Claim/MajorClaim may not be absolute due to the complexity and subjectivity of the real world.

- **Refuting Counterarguments:** anticipating potential counterarguments and explaining why they are not valid

An entity containing successfully refuted child entities that attack the Claim/MajorClaim can receive an Evidence score of 6. If successfully refuted, the opposing child entities will have a low Persuasiveness score. If the opposing child entities are unrefuted and carry persuasive power, they will detract

The entities must perform one of the above functions as opposed to making the argument indecisive or contradictory. Only then can the Evidence score a 6.

- *MajorClaim*

This score implies a high quantity of supporting claims with high persuasiveness and relevance scores. There are no attacking claims, or there are few attacking claims with low persuasiveness, for the purpose of refuting potential counterarguments.

- *Claim*

This means a diverse selection of high-quality premise types (e.g. real example, statistics, etc.) and high relevance. There might be one "opinion" premise type or a premise with low relevance, but the argument body is still strong regardless.

5 - Indicates a strong, persuasive argument body. There are sufficient supporting entities with respectable scores.

- *MajorClaim*

Indicates supporting entities for this argument have high relevance and high persuasive scores. There may be a conflicting claim, but its score is so low that it does not hurt the persuasiveness of the MajorClaim in question.

- *Claim*

There are numerous high quality premises. PremiseTypes are mostly homogeneous and are not varied. There might be enough premises with low relevance to distract from the subject, thereby detracting from the persuasiveness.

4 - Indicates a decent, fairly persuasive argument body.

- *MajorClaim*

There is a sufficient number of supporting claims to create a persuasive argument. The supporting claims have high relevance scores, and decent persuasiveness on their own. There might be a few strongly persuasive claims that take a stance against the MajorClaim.

- *Claim*

There is a small number of premises with strong premise types and high relevance. Or maybe there are many premises with too many low quality premises to be considered a very strong, persuasive argument.

3 - Indicates a poor, possibly persuasive argument body.

- *MajorClaim*

The supporting claims were unpersuasive and/or received low relevance scores. A MajorClaim that would have otherwise received a 5 or 6 can get reduced to a 3 if the strength of the claims against it approach the strength of those supporting it.

- *Claim*

A claim with an Evidence score of 3 means that there is a mix of persuasive premise types with decent relevance, and premise types that are weak with low relevance.

2 - Indicates a totally unpersuasive argument body.

- *MajorClaim*

All of the supporting claims had low persuasiveness scores, and/or low relevance. There are one or more strong, unrefuted Claims against it.

- *Claim*

Most, if not all of the supporting premises were opinions, and/or the majority of the premises had a low relevance score. There are a small number of supporting premises. Also, a claim will receive a score of 2 if there are too many opposing, unrefuted premises.

A score of 1 indicates that there is no argument body for the given entity.

- *MajorClaim* - No supporting claims.

- *Claim* - No supporting premises.